

sales revenues will not support the high costs of reregistration. The result is that many safe minor crop protection chemicals have been dropped from production, despite the essential role they play for our minor crop growers.

The production of the minor commodities, as they are called, is in fact of major importance to Washington State. In Washington, 90 percent of our agricultural industry is in minor crops. Most notable are hops, apples, small fruits, vegetables, and hay. Washington alone produces 77 percent of all commercially consumed hops in the United States. Hops growers have five pesticides available to them, and four of these are in danger of being lost due to the high cost of reregistration. If only one pesticide is available, pests will quickly develop their resistance and this compound will become obsolete as a tool for crop protection. Another example comes from the hay producers in Washington. The hay we grow makes up one-third of the world's hay market. We export 75 percent of our product. One particular pesticide which is essential to the growth cycle is in danger of not being reregistered. If it goes, with it will go our global market share.

This purpose of this bill is not an issue of public health or public safety, this is an issue of economics. It is designed to preserve safe minor use pesticides and to encourage the development of environmentally sound pest management tools. We need to provide the economic incentive for pesticide manufacturers to pursue the costly reregistration of products with limited market potential.

The Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Department of Agriculture recognize this situation. They have worked with a coalition of minor crop producers and my colleagues, Senator LUGAR and Senator INOUE, on this legislation. Accordingly, this bill streamlines the registration and reregistration process, and provides new incentives to the pesticide industry to pursue minor crop registrations. Most importantly, this bill reinforces EPA's authority to deny reregistration of minor use pesticides out of concern for public safety. In the Administrator's judgment, if a pesticide puts the public at too great a risk, the incentives for development, registration, or reregistration can be revoked.

A safe food supply is very important to me. Minor crops, which in large part are fruits and vegetables, are staples in the diets of infants and children, and they also receive large applications of pesticides. In its 1993 report, "Pesticides in the Diets of Infants and Children," the National Academy of Sciences found that current pesticide standards may be inadequate to protect infants and children from pesticide exposure and recommends policies to increase protection.

While this legislation addresses a market issue, it leaves us with the responsibility of addressing the complex issue of food safety and the adequacy of

the current pesticide regulatory system. In no way are we relieved of dealing with pesticide issues in a comprehensive manner.

I am very interested in promoting the development of newer, safer pesticides, and encouraging farmers to decrease their use of dangerous pesticides. Our efforts in this bill should go hand in hand with incentive-based approaches that encourage integrated pest management, and even organic production practices. I look forward to working with my colleagues to address the shortcomings of our current pesticide regulatory system, and to encourage innovative approaches for the future.

#### TRIBUTE TO MASSIMO SANTEUSANIO

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I would like to acknowledge a ceremony which was held yesterday in Boston to honor Mr. Massimo Santeusanio.

Mr. Santeusanio recently celebrated his 100th birthday and the ceremony is to honor not only this extraordinary event but his service during World War I. He is to this day an inspiration to those Americans who appreciate the unselfish sacrifices made in defense of freedom and liberty. During this Memorial Day period, I would like to express our country's gratitude to all World War I veterans through Massimo Santeusanio.

#### WELFARE REFORM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I have today received a copy of a resolution passed by the Rhode Island House of Representatives, outlining the devastating consequences that H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act, would have on the State of Rhode Island if it becomes law.

This resolution, introduced by Rhode Island State Representatives Benoit, Sherlock, Williams, Kellner, and Bumpus, articulates far better than I can the great damage that this legislation would do to the neediest of Rhode Island families.

As the welfare debate begins in earnest in the Senate, I hope that my colleagues will bear in mind the strong opposition of many in my State to this proposal, and will heed in particular the part of the Rhode Island House of Representatives' resolution which urges us to "Put children first by working for humane welfare reform that provides for all citizens in need during difficult economic times, that supports effective return-to-work programs, and that recognizes that the care given to our Nation's children is a shared Federal-State responsibility. \* \* \*

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution passed by the Rhode Island House of Representatives on May 10, 1995, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### HOUSE RESOLUTION

Whereas, under the provisions of the Personal Responsibility Act (H.R. 4), Aid to Families with Dependent Children would be replaced by the Temporary Family Assistance Block Grant, and the entitlement program which guarantees benefits to all children who qualify would be eliminated. Under the proposed block grant financing formula, Rhode Island would receive \$54 million less in federal funds over the next five years, and an estimated 25,000 children would be denied benefits; and

Whereas, while the Personal Responsibility Act purports to return control to the states, the block grant legislation, in reality, contains many federal prohibitions limiting states' freedom that would deny eligibility to several categories of children and families; and

Whereas, the Personal Responsibility Act would virtually eliminate cash assistance to 21% of the disabled children currently in the SSI program, and \$27 million less in federal funds would be available to Rhode Island over the next five years; and

Whereas, all child nutrition programs would be replaced by two block grants; federal funding would be reduced by 10%; federal nutrition standards would be repealed; eligibility for food stamps would be sharply curtailed by federal restrictions with the result that Rhode Island would receive a combined total of \$127 million less in federal funding over the next five years; and

Whereas, funding for several major child protection programs would be sharply reduced and replaced by a block grant, and Rhode Island would receive \$15 million less in federal funding over the next five years, sharply reducing funds for adoption assistance, foster care, and the computerization of the state's abuse and neglect tracking system; and

Whereas, essential child care programs that enable low-income families to work would lose their entitlement status; Rhode Island would receive \$8 million less in federal funding over the next five years and \$2.4 million less by the year 2000, thereby resulting in 1,570 fewer children receiving assistance; and

Whereas, most legal immigrants would be ineligible for most programs, leading to a loss in federal aid to Rhode Island of \$72 million over the next five years; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That this House of Representatives of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations hereby respectfully requests that the Rhode Island Congressional delegation:

1. Oppose the Personal Responsibility Act (H.R. 4) as passed by the United States House of Representatives; and

2. Put children first by working for humane welfare reform that provides for all citizens in need during difficult economic times, that supports effective return-to-work programs, and that recognizes that the care given to our nation's children is a shared federal-state responsibility; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State be and he hereby is authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the members of the Rhode Island Congressional Delegation.

#### NORWEST BANK OF COLORADO AND ATLANTIS COMMUNITY, INC.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I want to say a few words of congratulation to the people who work for

Norwest Bank of Colorado and Atlantis Community, Inc.

Atlantis Community is the largest home health care agency in Colorado, with an outstanding record of service to and advocacy for disabled individuals. With Norwest Bank, Atlantis developed a unique program to help lower income disabled people achieve an American dream: the dream of owning a home.

Atlantis and Norwest pioneered the Disability Community Homeownership Program to help provide home mortgage financing to disabled people. This program features 15- to 30-year first mortgage loans with no down payment, no closing costs, below market interest rates, and other advantages to qualified home buyers. In 1993, Norwest set aside \$2.5 million for loans to the disabled community. Norwest now has over \$6 million in home loans to 100 people with disabilities, who could not avail themselves of existing lending programs.

Atlantis teamed with Norwest to help build awareness of this program among the disabled community. In addition, Atlantis offers financial counseling and money management services specifically tailored to meet the needs of disabled people. The interest in these services was so high, Atlantis and Norwest decided to expand it to a consumer loan program for buying and modifying vehicles, improving disabled access to homes, and other purposes.

In recognition of these community-oriented efforts, Atlantis and Norwest received nominations for the Social Compact Outstanding Community Investment Award. Social Compact is a coalition of hundreds of leaders from the financial services and community development industries, coming together to strengthen American communities through neighborhood partnerships.

I congratulate Atlantis and Norwest for their nominations for this award, and I applaud their initiative for turning community concerns into concrete results.

#### WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, before contemplating today's bad news about the Federal debt, let us do that little pop quiz once more. You remember—one question, one answer:

Question: How many million dollars are in \$1 trillion? While you are arriving at an answer, bear in mind that it was the U.S. Congress that ran up the Federal debt that now exceeds \$4.8 trillion.

To be exact, as of the close of business Monday, May 15, the exact Federal debt—down to the penny—stood at \$4,881,377,281,278.42. This means that every man, woman, and child in America now owes \$18,529.79 computed on a per capita basis. Which, I might add, is an increase of \$22 million over the weekend.

Mr. President, back to the pop quiz: How man million in a trillion? There are a million, million in a trillion.

#### MEXICO IS A LENINIST STATE

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, in late January I came to the floor to speak of our relations with Mexico in the context of the new North American Free-Trade Agreement. My remarks appeared in the RECORD under the heading "Free Trade With an Unfree Society." I returned to a theme which I had stated on a number of occasions since NAFTA was first proposed during the administration of President Bush. I had been an enthusiastic supporter of the free-trade agreement with Canada, but was troubled by the thought of a similar arrangement with Mexico, and for the most elemental reason. I argued that the political and legal arrangements of the United States and Canada being essentially symmetrical, the vast involvement in one another's affairs, the partial ceding of sovereignty implicit in such an agreement would provide quite manageable. There would be no political loss and considerable economic gain. Optimality, as an economist might say. By contrast, I feared that our political and legal institutions were anything but symmetrical with those of Mexico. Mexico, I said, was a Leninist state.

I had hoped for some response to this statement from the executive branch, but there was little. Indeed, apart from a gracious note from our distinguished Treasury Secretary, Robert E. Rubin, there was none. In any event, we were then, in January, caught up in an intense effort to save Mexico from defaulting on its foreign debt. This was the first of what I fear will be a sequence of such crises, and it seemed gratuitous to press the argument in that atmosphere. But now the first crisis has eased, thanks in large measure to what Alexander Hamilton, our first Secretary of the Treasury, termed "energy in the executive," now embodied in his successor, Secretary Rubin. And so I would take this quiet morning to return to the subject.

I would begin by calling attention to an essay by William Pfaff, which appeared in the International Herald Tribune on March 16. Mr. Pfaff, who writes from Paris, is a foreign policy analyst of unexampled range, depth, and experience. He would be such if he lived in Utica, but living abroad gives him a singular perspective on American affairs. His essay begins with this simple, chilling analogy.

The commitment the United States now has made to Mexico bears a distinct resemblance to the commitment it made to Vietnam during the late 1950s and the early 1960s, when the troubles in that country were only beginning.

That was war and this is peace. Nonetheless now, as then, with as little reflection and a simplistic ideology, Washington has taken on responsibility for the fortunes of another nation that it scarcely knows and fails to understand.

In Mexico this American assumption of responsibility is primarily economic, but Mexico's economic plight is inseparable from the political crisis afflicting the eleven-decade-long dictatorship in Mexico of the PRI, or Institutional Revolutionary Party, historically the vehicle of Mexican nationalism—and of resistance to American exploitation of Mexican oil resources.

Washington has demanded, and last Friday was given, Mexico's promise of a program of economic austerity with distressing implications for millions of Mexicans, who only weeks ago were being told that their country's membership in NAFTA assured rising prosperity for them and their country. One aspect of the new arrangement is that a major part of Mexico's future oil revenues is pledged against the new American and international loan guarantees.

Even without the debt crisis a national upheaval is under way in Mexico which not even the Mexicans can be sure they can solve. Washington's commitment to a solution is an engagement with the uncontrollable and unforeseeable.

In my January statement I was unapologetic about discussing government in the abstract. I allowed as how Speaker GINGRICH, by encouraging us to read or re-read *The Federalist*, was directing us to just such abstractions, which very much engaged the Founders of the Nation. They ransacked history for different ideal types of government for lessons to be learned and contrasts to be made with the new American Republic which they had set about constructing. Here, then, is a definition of Leninism from the "Harper Dictionary of Modern Thought." The capitalized words are employed in the original for purposes of cross reference:

Leninism. The term refers to the version of MARXIST thought which accepts the validity of the major theoretical contributions made by Lenin to revolutionary Marxism. These contributions fall into two main groups. Central to the first was the conception of the revolutionary party as the vanguard of the PROLETARIAT. The workers, if left to their own devices, would concentrate on purely economic issues and not attain full political CLASS consciousness, and therefore the revolutionary seizure of power needed the leadership of committed Marxist ACTIVISTS to provide the appropriate theoretical and tactical guidelines. The role of the party was thus to be a "vanguard" in the revolutionary struggle which would culminate in the overthrow of the CAPITALIST STATE and the establishment of a DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT under the HEGEMONY of the party.

The second major theoretical contribution made by Lenin was to draw the political consequences from an analysis of CAPITALISM as both international and imperialist. The phenomenon of IMPERIALISM divided the world between advanced industrial nations and the colonies they were exploiting. This situation was inherently unstable and led to war between capitalist nations thus creating favorable conditions for REVOLUTION. For Lenin, the "weakest link" in the capitalist chain was to be found in UNDERDEVELOPED regions of the world economy such as Russia where the indigenous BOURGEOISIE was comparatively weak, but where there had been enough INDUSTRIALIZATION to create a class-conscious proletariat. The idea of world-wide SOCIALIST revolution beginning in relatively backward countries led to the inclusion of the peasantry as important